

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 remain pending in the application, with claims 13-19 and 32-38 being withdrawn from consideration.

Allowable Claims

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 12, 31 and 50 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30 over Burgan in view of Marquette

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Burgan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,459,892 ("Burgan") in view of Marquette et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,499,053 ("Marquette"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30 recite, *inter alia*, a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device.

Burgan appears to disclose a wireless communication system that includes a system controller, a chat server and a plurality of wireless communication devices (Abstract; Fig. 1). The chat server manages the communication of a plurality of chat discussions facilitating substantially real time communication among the plurality of wireless communication devices (Burgan, Abstract). The chat server receives a chat request and in response to such receipt, sends a chat response (Burgan, col. 3, lines 65-66). The chat request is communicated to the chat server via a server interface from a system controller and the chat response is communicated via the server interface to the system controller (Burgan, col. 3, line 67-col. 4, line 3). The system controller then routes the chat response to the requesting device which may be a message input device such as a telephone, a computer, a desktop messaging unit or an individual or wireless communication device (Burgan, col. 4, lines 4-10).

The Office Action correctly acknowledged that Burgan fails to disclose usage of an Internet Relay Chat server (Office Action, page 3). The

Office Action relies on Marquette to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Burgan to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Marquette appears to disclose a chat system that includes a chat server and a plurality of chat clients in a network that may be bandwidth constrained (Abstract). Chat clients are configured as either a master mode or a slave mode (Marquette, Abstract). A chat session proceeds with the chat member client sending chat input to the master client and the master client sending chat session updates to the member client (Marquette, Abstract). The chat server is connected to a LAN or Internet (Marquette, Fig. 1). The mobile chat clients are connected to the LAN or Internet through a mobile base station (Marquette, Fig. 1).

Marquette discloses a chat server connected to the Internet. However, Marquette fails to disclose or suggest the configuration claimed. A chat server connected to the Internet is NOT a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between an Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device, as recited by claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30.

Moreover, the Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to modify Burgan with the disclosure of Marquette. Burgan fails to even mention the Internet. Adding an Internet chat server to a system that isn't even connected to the Internet would serve no purpose whatsoever.

Moreover, an Internet Relay Chat server is a term of art NOT equating to any chat server connected to the Internet.

Neither Burgan nor Marquette, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device, as recited by claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30.

A benefit results from placing a mobile chat proxy server between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server, e.g., efficient transfer of data. A proxy server integrates the components within a communication path by serving as a proxy between a wireless Internet gateway

and a standard IRC server. A proxy server enables a rich client application for an otherwise “incompatible” or limited capacity device (such as a wireless handset). Such a benefit is not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-5, 7, 9, 20-24, 26, 28 and 30 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 over Burgan in view of Holmes

In the Office Action, claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Burgan in view of Holmes et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,178,331 (“Holmes”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 are dependent on claims 1 and 20 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 20.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 recite, *inter alia*, a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device.

As discussed above (and as acknowledged by the Examiner), Burgan fails to disclose a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device, as recited by claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29.

The Office Action correctly acknowledged that Burgan fails to disclose using SMPP or a short message system controller (Office Action, page 5). However, the Office Action relies on Holmes to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Burgan to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Holmes appears to disclose a bi-directional multiplexing messaging gateway for wireless devices (Abstract). Kernel processes within the gateway comprise short message system SMS that manages interaction with SMSC via a communications protocol (SMPP for SMS systems) (col. 3, lines 19-24).

Holmes fails to make up for the deficiencies in Burgan. Holmes fails to disclose or suggest use of either a mobile chat proxy server or an Internet

Relay Chat server, much less suggest a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device, as claimed by claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29.

Neither Burgan nor Holmes, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a mobile chat proxy server in a direct communication path between a standard Internet Relay Chat server and a wireless gateway server supporting a mobile device, as claimed by claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29.


A benefit of a chat proxy server is, e.g., that the chat proxy server can also be extended to other "messaging" protocols.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6, 8, 10, 25, 27 and 29 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman  
Reg. No. 36,457

Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC  
2000 M Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036-3307  
TEL. (202) 261-1020  
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df